

R E M A R K S

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed September 11, 2007.

Applicants believe that the currently pending claims are not anticipated by or obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth below and respectfully request reconsideration.

IDS

A replacement IDS is being filed along with an RCE with the present response.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1-5 and 7-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being drawn to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that Applicants' claims lack hardware elements and do not produce a "concrete useful tangible final result". Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. In a computer implemented method of verifying an event that signals when errors are found, the lack of a signaled error is a tangible indication that an error was not found. Thus, Applicants believe that the computer implemented verification method of claim 1 produces a "useful, concrete, and tangible result" in all cases whether errors are found or not - in the case that an error is found, the method signals an error. If an error is not found, the method does not signal an error and the user of the method is aware that no error was found or signaled and that therefore the events were correctly generated by the agent. The user of the method is

Appl. No. 10/712,855

thus provided with the "useful, concrete, and tangible result" of knowing in either case whether events were correctly generated by the agent.

Furthermore, the computer implementing the method is a hardware element. A computer implemented method is not an abstract idea, it is a process that is performed by a hardware element. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that each of Applicant's remaining claims is directed to statutory subject matter as defined by 35 U.S.C. 101 and therefore respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for use of the term "appropriately" in the independent claims. The independent claims have been amended to remove the term "appropriately". Support for the amendments can be found at least in originally filed claims 7 and 9. No new matter has been added. The Applicants believe that the claims, as amended, are definite and complete and respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sharma, U.S. Patent No. 6,412,046. Applicants believe that the claims, as amended, are allowable over Sharma and respectfully request reconsideration.

Applicants continue to believe that the claims are allowable at least for the reasons set forth in the previous

response, including that Sharma does not disclose or suggest determining whether generation of an event by an agent in response to a stimulus is conditional. Applicants further believe that the claims, as amended, are allowable over Sharma because Sharma does not disclose creating an expectation of an event, indicating that it is speculative, monitoring conditions relating to the event and either promoting the speculative expectation to a non-speculative expectation or deleting it, and finally determining whether the non-speculative event occurred and making sure the event for a deleted expectation did not occur. For example, the Examiner has referred to Sharma, FIG. 5 element 500 and the associated description as disclosing the deletion of a speculative expectation if conditions indicate that a speculatively expected event should not take place. Element 500 is a step in a process for verifying a cache prefetch mechanism. In step 500, a determination is made about whether a memory transaction is a fetch or a prefetch operation. See Sharma, col. 6, lines 51-54 and col. 7, lines 6-13:

"FIG. 5 is a flow chart illustrating finder processes for verifying the cache prefetch mechanism. The process begins at block 500, where the request is checked to be either a fetch or a prefetch. "

"In block 500, if the transaction is a prefetch, the process moves to block 515, and the cache line address prefetched is checked to see if greater than or equal to the last cache line address prefetched. If not greater, the process moves to block 520, and an error flag is set. If greater than or equal, the process moves to block 535, where the last cache line address prefetched is set equal to the cache line address prefetched, the cache line address is marked as accessed, and the cache lines accessed is incremented."

Sharma does not indicate that speculative expectations are created and then either promoted or deleted. Please note

Appl. No. 10/712,855

that the speculative expectation of the claims is not merely a step in a verification process at which conditions indicate that some event may take place in the future, such as the indication that a memory transaction has been received and determining whether that memory transaction is a fetch or a prefetch operation. For example, claim 1 recites detecting a stimulus, creating an expectation, indicating that the expectation is speculative, then promoting or deleting the expectation, and finally verifying whether any event related to the promoted or deleted expectation occurred properly.

In view of the above, all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

By: /Guy K. Clinger/
Guy K. Clinger, Esq.
Registration No. 42,422
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 298-9888
Fax: (303) 297-2266